

OGC Has Reviewed

FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF
BOX 1282
MAIN POST OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

PROGRAM PAT MICHAELS SHOW STATION KNEW RADIO

DATE OCTOBER 9, 1967 CITY OAKLAND
11:28 P.M.

SLEEPYHEAD GARRISON RECAPS INVESTIGATION

(PAT MICHAELS INTERVIEWS JIM GARRISON)

PAT MICHAELS: This is Pat Michaels at KNEW in the San Francisco Bay Area and I believe we have on the line now Mr. Melvin Belli's house guest of the weekend, Mr. Jim Garrison, the district attorney of Orleans Parrish in Louisiana, are you there, Mr. Garrison?

JIM GARRISON: Yes, and Mel is asleep.

MICHAELS: You're asleep--Mel is asleep but you're not.

GARRISON: I'm half asleep but he is sound asleep and I don't want to wake him.

MICHAELS: Mr. Garrison, what are you doing in San Francisco?

GARRISON: Purely social because I'm a friend of Mel's and I went to L.A. on business so I came up here to visit with Mel a little bit.

MICHAELS: Does Mr. Belli's defense of Jack Ruby figure into your investigation in New Orleans?

GARRISON: No, this is purely social and because I admire him as a great lawyer.

MICHAELS: Do you think that you might call on Mr. Belli's services when your case gets to court down there?

GARRISON: No, there is no connection.

MICHAELS: No connection whatsoever?

GARRISON: No, none at all.

MICHAELS: You are reported in the papers looking for some particular points of information for your case, Mr. Garrison, is that true?

GARRISON: No. I probably didn't make myself clear. I just came out to confirm some things in the West Coast area and they are not even that interesting. It was just kind of a follow-up.

Hey listen, if I sound vague, it's because I was asleep when the phone rang too, but Mel is even more asleep because he has been driving at the office but it was just a case of following up on routine things so I thought that I would kill two birds with one stone, but there is no special point.

MICHAELS: Mr. Garrison, you were also quoted as giving some statements regarding the biography of Dr. Milton Helpern, the chief medical examiner for New York City.

GARRISON: I thought everything that I said was off the record. Did I say some things on the record?

MICHAELS: Well, apparently this is in the paper tonight, sir.

GARRISON: Okay.

MICHAELS: What is your interest in Dr. Helpern?

GARRISON: Well, Dr. Helpern is--nobody disputes that Dr. Helpern is the best surgic pathologist in the United States, nobody disputes that.

MICHAELS: And how does he figure into your investigation of the Kennedy assassination?

GARRISON: He doesn't figure into our investigations at all but he pointed out that the Warren Commission--the Warren Commission just failed to use the first rate kind of pathologist that he represents.

In other words, the point is--the point is that there was never an objective examination of the x-ray photographs or the autopsy photographs by a first rate pathologist.

MICHAELS: Have these x-ray photographs been made available to your investigation?

GARRISON: They haven't been made available to anybody, are you kidding bud?

MICHAELS: Can you subpoena them?

GARRISON: Well, I can, but some federal judge will rule that I can't.

MICHAELS: What do you think that your investigation is going to lead to, Mr. Garrison?

GARRISON: I think that it is going to lead to complete exposure of the people who killed the President of the United States, it won't even be close.

MICHAELS: You indicate that Oswald did not commit the murder, you said this several times.

GARRISON: No, he did not and it's not close but again I have to make one more apology because I'm sure that I sound like I had thirteen beers or something. I have been asleep about forty-five minutes and Mel has been asleep about an hour and a half so I decided that I had to take it.

MICHAELS: Mel asked me to call him back in about an hour. He said that, you know, you were going to have dinner and he said to be sure and call back in an hour. So I guess he kind of flaked out on us there.

GARRISON: It was my fault I decided not to wake him but--this isn't---because Oswald never shot anyone in his life. There is no question about that.

MICHAELS: Well, who do you think set him up, if he was set up, indeed?

GARRISON: There are so many people that I couldn't name them now but people mostly in Dallas and some in New Orleans.

MICHAELS: You have indicated also that perhaps the CIA is involved in this, sir?

GARRISON: No, not in the murder itself, although there were two employees in the CIA who were just above the operating level who kept control of Oswald but outside of that the CIA at the policy making level is absolutely not involved, on the other hand, they would have been embarrassed by the fact that Oswald was, at the time of the assassination, a CIA employee.

MICHAELS: Mr. Garrison, we have heard a lot of reports. As journalists out here on the West Coast, we would like to throw this question in the tube, that to a large extent what you have been investigating is surrounded by a homosexual--or in other words, there are a lot of people involved allegedly in this area of investigation, the people that you are investigating, who are or have been engaged in homosexual activity; is that true?

GARRISON: I would answer by saying that most of the people that we have been investigating, most of

the people involved are a kind of old-fashioned like you or me in that they like girls.

MICHAELS: In other words, there have not been homosexuals involved in this.

GARRISON: Yes, there have but it's peripheral, it's not a major factor.

MICHAELS: Was it true that Oswald was involved in some sort of homosexual activity?

GARRISON: I can't comment on that.

MICHAELS: Mr. Garrison, when do you think that you will be able to have a chance to present your information?

GARRISON: Well, that's hard to say because the Shell case itself will be restricted by the rules of evidence but I'm confident that ultimately it won't even be close, it's just not close.

The Shell case will probably be delayed because the defendant just asked last week for a six-month delay in the trial. We were ready. We opposed it but I guess he will get about a four-month delay so some time early next year...but even so, even at the Shell trial, the rules of evidence are very, very constrictive, it doesn't mean that you go into the entire Texas affair at that time, and of course, the main thing really is Texas.

MICHAELS: When do you expect to reveal the people that you suspect of committing the actual murder?

GARRISON: Well, the whole thing will take about another year, I regret to say, but I would say about another year, it's that complicated. There was that much planning.

MICHAELS: Mr. Garrison, do you plan any exciting revelations between now and next year, before this comes about?

GARRISON: If I had some exciting revelations please believe me, I would avoid them, delay them, I don't plan them, you know.

MICHAELS: There have been some indications in the new book, Lee, which was written by Oswald's brother and the two other authors that there was a great deal of suspicion at the time of the murder of the FBI, have you any comment on that?

GARRISON: If I had some...the FBI did the best job of any federal agency in the entire investigation, the commission exhibits of the FBI, and their presence in

the twenty-six volumes is one of the reasons that the door is not closed. I do not see how any fair-minded person could criticize the FBI at all. Of all the possible federal agencies, and there are a number, the FBI is the least culpable.

MICHAELS: What would you consider or tell me a culpable agency?

GARRISON: The CIA.

MICHAELS: Was Oswald actually working for the CIA at one time?

GARRISON: Yes, it was not just one time but from the three years that he was admitted all the way up to the day he was executed in Dallas.

MICHAELS: What do you mean executed?

GARRISON: Well, it was a foregone conclusion that he had no chance, it was just a removal of him because he knew too much and he could have told how the whole thing happened.

So that is what I call an execution in other words, it was nothing else, there was no way for him to survive.

MICHAELS: On of the professors of the University of California at San Diego wrote a book called, The Other Oswald, which I'm sure has come to your attention, do you believe the theory that there were two Oswalds?

GARRISON: The Second Oswald.

MICHAELS: What's that?

GARRISON: The Second Oswald, by Richard Tompkins.

MICHAELS: Yes, do you believe his theory?

GARRISON: I don't like the title of the book, but he didn't title it. It's not a theory, it's fact, he just referred to the fact that prior to the assassination there was activity by another individual who kind of set it up to make it easier to charge Oswald, but it wasn't necessary it turned out because they just--the Dallas police kind of charged Oswald and lined him up because he was a Marxist in quotes and then the federal establishment bought the story.

MICHAELS: Well, if he was a Marxist, how did he get on the payroll of the CIA? Or how did he get to work for the CIA?

GARRISON: Because he was not a Marxist.

MICHAELS: He was not really a Marxist.

GARRISON: Never, never was a communist, never. Not even close, bud.

MICHAELS: Sir, there have been rumors or reports that you have alleged that the right wing of this country was responsible for the death of the president.

GARRISON: There were but not in the sense of conservatives, there are no legitimate conservative organizations involved but individuals from the, what we call, para-military right wing were involved yet, but no single organization.

MICHAELS: I thank you very much, Mr. Garrison, for giving us your time. Are you going back to New Orleans tomorrow?

GARRISON: Well, first I'm going to get in bed and go to sleep, and then I'm going to leave probably for New Orleans tomorrow but I did not want to wake Mel up and I hope I wasn't too fuzzy when I talked to you.

MICHAELS: By the way, how many beers did you have?

GARRISON: I didn't have any beers, I just got tired from pushing and I went to sleep about 10:30 tonight and I woke up when the phone rang.

MICHAELS: I thank you Mr. Garrison for talking with us.

GARRISON: I'm not against beers, I just didn't have time tonight, that's all.

MICHAELS: Thank you for talking to us sir and good night.

GARRISON: It was my pleasure.

STATINTL

Approved For Release 2002/08/28 : CIA-RDP79-00632A000100100003-6

Next 3 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2002/08/28 : CIA-RDP79-00632A000100100003-6

Clark Denies Prosecution of Garrison Hint

By ROBERT WALTERS
Star Staff Writer

A Justice Department spokesman denied yesterday that Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark had told a group of Virginia College students that he "might have to prosecute Jim Garrison," the controversial district attorney of New Orleans.

"The attorney general has not given any thought to a case against Garrison and the Justice Department has no plans for any such case," said Cliff Sessions, the department's chief public information officer.

But the reporter who wrote the story for the Charlottesville Daily Progress, Rey Barry, said yesterday, "There's no question he (Clark) said it."

Clark was reported to have said prosecution was possible in an informal question-and-answer session following a speech Friday night before the University of Virginia's Student Legal Forum in Charlottesville.

Quoted by Reporter

Barry quoted Clark as saying: "He (Garrison) took a perfectly fine man, Clay Shaw, and ruined him just for personal aggrandizement."

Barry said Clark also said: "Much as I hate to do it, I just might have to prosecute Jim Garrison."

Shaw, a prominent New Orleans businessman, is one of several persons being prosecuted by Garrison on charges of participating in a 1963 plot to assassinate President John F. Kennedy.

Barry, who covered the Clark speech for his newspaper, said the attorney general did not mention Garrison during his address, but said one question was asked about the subject during the formal question-and-answer period which followed.

When the formal program had concluded, about six or eight persons, including the reporter, moved onto the stage to talk with Clark, and it was then that Clark made his comments about Garrison, Barry said.

"All About Garrison"

"Clark was in no great hurry," Barry added. "We talked about 10 or 20 minutes, and it was almost all about the Garrison situation. . . . There's no question that he said it."

Clark was not available for comment yesterday.

MR. VANCE *mv*

MR. BANNERMAN

Non mtg 16 Oct 1963

SECRET

Approved For Release 2002/08/28 : CIA-RDP79-00632A000100100003-6

One page summary of the DCI memo prepared by OGC, dated 29 Sept 67
Subject: Clay Shaw's Trial and the CIA

1. The investigation of DA Garrison now focuses on the trial of Clay Shaw. Garrison has been careful not to reveal his theory of the trial. He could restrict himself ~~to~~ an attempt to prove a conspiracy among Shaw, Oswald, Ferrie and possibly others without involving CIA. Garrison will have to prove at least one overt act in pursuance ~~of~~ the conspiracy, and with Oswald and Ferrie both dead, we do not know of such an act which he could prove.

2. We speculate that he will try to involve others and bring out testimony that they were involved in such things as the movement of arms and money in pursuance of a conspiracy. Conceivably this could be done without involving CIA; Garrison has been concentrating on an unidentified group of Dallas oil men of the extreme right wing. He plays the recurring theme that those who actually carried out the assassination were people who had been associated with CIA and that CIA had set up Oswald as the patsy to detract attention from the true assassins. It would seem probable that Garrison would attempt to involve CIA and he should be able to produce witnesses who can testify at least to some peripheral connection with his case. He may well be able to involve CIA in the trial.

3. The paper serves up several speculations to illustrate the problems with which the Agency will be faced if Garrison pursues this course. ILLEGIB

4. The story of CIA's connections and interrelationships will be enough to at least confuse a jury. Shaw's lawyers have no way of refuting these stories except by attacking the credibility of these stories or introduce other witnesses to impeach their story. The Government and CIA are placed in a quandry. In view of this dilemma the Department of Justice has so far taken a position that if any effort is made by either prosecution or defense to involve CIA in the trial the Government will claim executive privilege. This can be turned by Garrison into a claim that it's part of the whole cover up by the establishment and particularly CIA. No alternative to the claim of privilege appears to be available. To protect the Government's position on privilege, it would appear that the Government cannot take any action publicly to refute Garrison's claims and the testimony of the witnesses, as the judge would almost certainly take the position that any such possible statement would negate the privilege.

5. There is no action we can recommend for the Director or the Agency to take. If during the trial it appears that Shaw may be convicted on information that could be refuted by CIA, ~~we~~ we may be in for some difficult decisions.

Approved For Release 2002/08/28 : CIA-RDP79-00632A000100100003-6

SECRET



RBW - 10-3-67

STATINTL

Approved For Release 2002/08/28 : CIA-RDP79-00632A000100100003-6

Approved For Release 2002/08/28 : CIA-RDP79-00632A000100100003-6

SENDER WILL CHECK CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM			
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL	SECRET
<div>Approved For Release 2002/08/28 : CIA-RDP79-00632A000100100003-6</div>			
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP			
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	DDS BX 4		
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
ACTION	DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL	DISPATCH	RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT	FILE	RETURN	
CONCURRENCE	INFORMATION	SIGNATURE	
Remarks:			
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER			
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.			DATE
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL	SECRET
<div>Approved For Release 2002/08/28 : CIA-RDP79-00632A000100100003-6</div>			